



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/872,007	06/04/2001	Tomohiko Kudo	WN-2343	3644

7590 05/20/2003  
McGinn & Gibb, PLLC  
Suite 200  
8321 Old Courthouse Road  
Vienna, VA 22182-3817

EXAMINER

SOWARD, IDA M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2822

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/872,007

Applicant(s)

KUDO ET AL.

Examiner

Ida M Soward

Art Unit

2822

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3-19 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2822

## **DETAILED ACTION**

This Office Action is in response to the Applicants' amendment filed on April 28, 2003.

### ***Response to Amendment***

Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

### ***Election/Restrictions***

In regard to the remarks concerning method claims 3-19, the inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons: The inventions of device claims 1-2 and method claims 3-19 are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, selectively doping fluorine ions into a first part of the second region could have been performed by either thermal diffusion or ion implantation to obtain the same semiconductor device structure.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 2822

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is not clear as to which MOSFET the first MOSFET has lower threshold level than (the second MOSFET or the third MOSFET). The same is true with the second and third MOSFET.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Houlihan et al. (US 6,258,673 B1) in view of Campardo et al. (6,060,753).

Houlihan et al. teach a semiconductor device comprising: a first MOSFET **205** having a first gate oxide film **24**; a second MOSFET **305** of n-type conductivity having a second gate oxide film **26** thicker than the first gate oxide film; and a third MOSFET **405** having a third gate oxide film **28** which is thicker than the first gate oxide film and is thinner than the second gate oxide film (Figure 4, col. 3, lines 36-51). Houlihan et al. further teach an oxide thickness appropriate for a desired threshold voltage (abstract). However, Houlihan et al. fail to teach a third MOSFET of p-type conductivity and a

Art Unit: 2822

single CMOS pair. Campardo et al. teach a third MOSFET of p-type conductivity and a single CMOS pair (Figure 5, cols. 4-5, lines 42-67 and 1-40, respectively). Since, Houlihan et al. and Campardo et al. are from the same field of endeavor (CMOS gated field effect transistors), the purpose disclosed by Campardo et al. would have been recognized in the pertinent of Houlihan et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the gate oxide thickness of Houlihan et al. by incorporating the third MOSFET of p-type conductivity and the single CMOS pair of Campardo et al. to provide a low-noise output stage for an electronic circuit integrated on a semiconductor substrate (abstract).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the newly applied reference.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents are cited to further show the state of the art with respects to single CMOS pairs:

Matsushita (4,881,112)

Schlais et al. (5,930,613)

Teng (5,049,519)

Tomassetti (4,912,054).

Art Unit: 2822

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ida M Soward whose telephone number is 703-305-3308. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 6:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amir Zarabian can be reached on 703-308-4905. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-8729318 for regular communications and 703-872919 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

ims  
January 26, 2003

  
**AMIR ZARABIAN**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800**